

REMARKS

Claims 1-47 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 24 have been amended herein. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-47 UNDER 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-47 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on Woodgate, primarily in view of Hart and Taniguchi. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

As noted, the Examiner now rejects each of the claims under 35 USC §103(a) based on Woodgate primarily in view of Hart and Taniguchi. The Examiner appears to accept applicants' previous arguments that Woodgate and Hart do not disclose a controller enabling a user to select a crosstalk level. However, the Examiner contends that Taniguchi teaches the implementation of user-selected or adjusted crosstalk level, and therefore it would have been obvious to modify Woodgate and Hart so as to result in the claimed invention.

Even assuming the Examiner is correct in noting that Taniguchi teaches enabling a user to select or adjust crosstalk level, such adjustment appears to be based on the arrangement of parallax images and stripe portions. Specifically, Taniguchi appears to describe control in connection with the pitch and position of the respective elements.

On the other hand, the present invention is directed towards reducing the amount of crosstalk caused by ambient light which is reflected to the eyes of an observer based on a combination of transmitted and reflected light found in the transfective spatial light modulator.

In other words, even if Taniguchi teaches adjustment to reduce crosstalk for a user, Taniguchi does not teach control for reducing crosstalk due to a change in the amount of reflected light relative to transmitted light in conjunction with a transfective display as in the present invention. Thus, Taniguchi is not teaching control which is

based on the adjustment of the relative transmissivities found in the respective regions as in the present invention.

In order to emphasize further such distinctions, applicants have amended claims 1 and 24 to recite:

... said controller being further arranged to set said at least some of said pixels of said at least one second region of said modulator to a transmissivity according to a user selected crosstalk level for assessing crosstalk due to a change in the amount of reflected light relative to transmitted light in conjunction with the transfective spatial light modulator by the appearance of said at least one first and second regions.

The present invention is related to the crosstalk of a transfective display which degrades the 3D effect of the image, wherein the crosstalk is caused by ambient light which is reflected to the eyes of an observer from the display, causing an observer to see a mixture of light transmitted from the backlight through the spatial light modulator and ambient light modulated by the SLM and reflected by a reflective layer, and adds visual stress to the observer. (See, e.g., Spec., p. 3, Ins. 3-21).

The present invention is directed to providing an arrangement which allows the ambient light reflected light and image crosstalk to be assessed, so that the observer can determine whether such display can be used to display 3D images (See, e.g., Spec., para. bridging pgs. 5-6). In particular, a controller is provided to adjust the intensity of the pixels of the second region 34 according to a user selected crosstalk level so that the crosstalk due to a change in the amount of reflected light relative to transmitted light in conjunction with a transfective special light modulator can be assessed by the appearance of the first and second regions. (See, e.g., Spec. p. 9, Ins. 1-7; and para. bridging pgs. 10-11).

Regarding Woodgate, as admitted by the Examiner, Woodgate does not disclose a transfective display, rather it discloses a transmissive display that does not reflect any ambient light. In fact, Woodgate is silent on ambient light or ambient illumination. Therefore, it fails to teach or suggest crosstalk due to a change in the amount of reflected light relative to transmitted light in conjunction with the transfective spatial light

modulator. As indicated in Woodgate, the crosstalk of Woodgate is caused by the observer's viewing angle (Col. 7, ln. 66 to Col. 8, ln. 5). As recited in amended claims 1 and 24, the present invention addresses crosstalk caused by ambient light or more specifically the change in the amount of reflected light relative to transmitted light in conjunction with the transfective spatial light modulator.

Regarding Hart, the reference merely suggests the CRT 444 can be replaced by a transfective LCD for displaying images without any detailed teaching. Moreover, Hart does not contain any discussion regarding crosstalk. It only describes a method and apparatus for making holograms, which is a completely different method and apparatus as to teach or suggest crosstalk due to a change in the amount of reflected light relative to transmitted light in conjunction with the transfective spatial light modulator.

Regarding Taniguchi, similar to Woodgate, Taniguchi does not appear to disclose a transfective display. For example, Figure 5 of Taniguchi shows the structure of the spatial light modulator 2 having only a polarizing plate and a TN liquid crystal cell. It does not contain any reflective layer to reflect ambient light. Moreover, as shown in Figure 6, the polarizing plate 26 is for transmission only. Therefore, Taniguchi fails to teach or suggest crosstalk due to a change in the amount of reflected light relative to transmitted light in conjunction with the transfective spatial light modulator. Moreover, the crosstalk of Taniguchi appears to be related to the stripe image not being synchronized with the parallax barrier pattern formed on the electronic parallax barrier (see, col. 2, lns. 26-33), which is different from the crosstalk of the present invention.

Even assuming that Taniguchi teaches a controller enabling a user to select a crosstalk level as asserted by the Examiner, since the crosstalk addressed by the present invention is different from the crosstalk addressed by Taniguchi, the adjustment of Taniguchi would not be based on the same crosstalk level as the present invention. Therefore, Taniguchi fails to disclose a controller is further arranged to set said at least some of said pixels of said at least one second region of said modulator to a transmissivity according to a user selected crosstalk level for assessing crosstalk due to a change in the amount of reflected light relative to transmitted light in conjunction with

the transfective spatial light modulator by the appearance of said at least one first and second regions.

Consequently, whether taken alone or in combination, Woodgate, Hart and Taniguchi fail to teach or render obvious an autostereoscopic display as recited in amended claims 1 and 24. There is no teaching or suggestion of a controller being further arranged to set at least some of the pixels of at least one second region of a modulator to a transmissivity according to a user selected crosstalk level for assessing crosstalk due to a change in the amount of reflected light relative to transmitted light in conjunction with the transfective spatial light modulator by the appearance of said at least one first and second regions. Moreover, the tertiary reference fails to make up for such deficiencies.

Applicants therefore respectfully request the rejection of claims 1, 24 and the claims dependent therefrom be withdrawn.

II. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all claims 1-47 are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Mark D. Saralino/

Mark D. Saralino

Reg. No. 34,243

DATE: October 1, 2008

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113